

SWT Planning Committee - 14 October 2021

Present: Councillor Simon Coles (Chair)

Councillors Norman Cavill (substitute for Roger Habgood), Marcia Hill, John Hassall, Mark Lithgow, Sarah Wakefield, Brenda Weston, Keith Wheatley and Loretta Whetlor

Officers: Rebecca Miller (Principal Planning Specialist), Alison Blom-Cooper, Roy Pinney (Shape Legal), Karen Wray (Planning Specialist) and Denise Grandfield (Planning Specialist) Abigail James (Planning Specialist) and Clare Rendell (Governance and Democracy Specialist)

Also Present: Councillor Lisgo

(The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm)

49. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Blaker, Habgood and Palmer

50. Minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning Committee

(Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 12 August and 2 September 2021 circulated with the agenda)

Resolved that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 12 August and the 2 September 2021 be confirmed as a correct record.

12 August - Proposed by Councillor Coles seconded by Councillor Hill

2 September – Proposed by Councillor Lithgow seconded by Councillor Hill

The **Motion** was carried.

51. Declarations of Interest or Lobbying

Members present at the meeting declared the following personal interests in their capacity as a Councillor or Clerk of a County, Town or Parish Council or any other Local Authority:-

Name	Application No.	Description of Interest	Reason	Action Taken
Cllr N Cavill	3/24/21/003 3/24/21/004	Declared that he was a farmer	Personal	Spoke and Voted
Cllr J Hassell	53/21/0006	Approached by resident. Element of	Personal	Spoke and did not vote

		predetermination on the application		
Cllr B Weston	38/21/0222	Applicant sought advice on application	Personal	Spoke and did not vote
Cllr L Whetlor	3/37/21/006	Ward Cllr. Contacted by the applicant. Discretion not fettered.	Personal	Spoke and did not vote

52. **Public Participation**

Application No.	Name	Position	Stance
10/21/0011	C Morrison-Jones G Easey E Woodruff Cllr Henley	Local Res Local Res Agent Ward Cllr	Objection Objection In favour Objection
3/24/21/003	I Mackie M Crothers S Moore H Carnac	Local Res Local Res Applicant Local Res	Objection Objection In favour objection
3/24/21/004	I Mackie M Crothers S Moore H Carnac	Local Res Local Res Applicant Local Res	Objection Objection In favour Objection
3/37/21/006	F Harding G Hall M Ritchie S Vincent R Vincent	Local Res Local Res Local Res Applicant Applicant	Objection Objection Objection In favour In favour
38/21/0222	S McMahon P Watson D Stutt Cllr Lisgo	Local Res Relative Applicant Ward Cllr	In favour In favour In favour In favour
53/21/0006	J Rees C Wide T Spurway	Applicant Applicant Agent	In favour In favour In favour

53. **3/02/21/002**

Replacement of dwelling. Pleasant View, Parish Quarry Road, Brompton Ralph

Application **Deferred** from the agenda as the Ecologist requires a Preliminary Roost Assessment before a decision can be made. Application will be reported to committee once this survey work has been undertaken and reviewed by the Local Planning Authority.

54. 10/21/0011

Change of use of land from agricultural to mixed agricultural and equine use and laying of hardstanding at Merlands, Stapley Road, Biscombe, Churchstanton (in accordance with amended plans received on 16 April 2021)

Comments from members of the public included;

- Concerns that the usage of turnout evolving into an actual usage of riding and lunging activities which were far more impactful were not included in the application;
- The current agricultural use effectively limits the number of horses on site to those that can be fed and sheltered in the stable yard area. Equine use would permit the rugging and supplementary feeding of horses over the entire property and, contrary to the Officers report, would allow more horses to be kept on site than can otherwise be supported if dependant on the stables;
- Concerns with the number of horses kept at Merlands since the use started;
- Concerns with the impact of the applicant's ongoing use of Merlands for the last 18 months on The Orchard where the application has impacted the home and amenities safety and the impact had resulted in the euthanasia of three horses;
- Concerns with the construction of multiple areas of unauthorised hardstanding, the installation of prohibited lighting, muck heap in environmentally sensitive areas and works to important hedges during protected seasons;
- No consideration for the neighbours, ANOB or the surrounding environment;
- The development was contrary to Local and National Policies;
- Concerns with the impact of on the ecology of the area;
- Concerns with the potential highway and traffic issues on the narrow lanes in this very rural location;
- Concerns that this application would not be sensitive to the surrounding area and neighbouring properties;
- The applicant's private home would not be upscaled in any way by this development nor would it materially change. The applicant's primary and sole objective was to simply permit the horses to be turned out to graze onto land ancillary to the existing private stable with a rug on and supplementary feed when required;
- The landscape character of the area would not be harmed by this application;
- The use of the land may well be used for agricultural purposes including haymaking and grazing if necessary, to manage the weed population;
- This proposal would allow both horses and agricultural livestock to occupy the land for grazing in a non intensive system.

- This landscape character was maintained in line with Policies DM1 and the Blackdown Hills Management Plan;

Comments from Members included;

- Concerns with the breaches of Planning stipulations on this application. Officers would need to keep an eye on this site;
- Concerns with wording in Condition 4;
- It was hard to see the harm in the application;

Councillor Hill proposed and Councillor Lithgow seconded a motion for **Conditional Approval** to be approved as per Officer Recommendation

The motion was carried

55. **3/24/21/003**

Erection of an agricultural livestock building with creation of access track from highway. Land north of Beggearn Huish Manor, Washford

Comments from members of the public included;

- There was substantial opposition from all the houses bar one in the area and the Parish Council;
- Premature application due to changes and additional land not available until April 2022;
- Highway comments should not be taken into consideration as they were commissioned before the change in circumstances;
- Concerns that there was no indication of vehicle volumes or types to be used;
- No mention of how feed was to be delivered to the site or how the waste was to be disposed of;
- Concerns with lighting, noise and the visual impact;
- A Condition was needed to state that the applicant's fencing business should not be brought on site;
- Concerns with the inability of the local roads to accommodate anything approaching feed delivery lorries and particularly the materials which would go on to the site to construct the building and dwelling, due to the narrow roads. A full traffic assessment was needed;
- Both planning applications were fully planning compliant and supported by an Agricultural Consultant;
- The site was chosen to minimise the impact on neighbours and the surrounding countryside. Due to the topography of the ground the site would be virtually hidden from all angles;
- All feed would be supplied locally and picked up on pallets with a tractor and trailer so no need for heavy lorries to come onto the site;
- The business would supply the Local Butcher;

Comments from Members included;

- Pleased to see that the applicant was carrying on the farming tradition as this was not an easy business to choose;
- Highways had already looked very carefully at this application and were satisfied;
- Clarity needed on the additional land;
- Concerns from objectors regarding the disposal of farm waste was highly regulated so there would not be any issues with this;
- This was a young enterprise and would undoubtedly be serviced by appropriate vehicles;

Councillor Lithgow proposed and Councillor Hill seconded a motion for Conditional Approval to be **APPROVED** as per Officer Recommendation.

The motion was carried.

56. **3/24/21/004**

Erection of 1 No. temporary agricultural workers dwelling. Land north of Beggearn Huish Manor, Washford

Comments from members of the public included;

- Concerns with the size and appropriateness of the setting of the site;
- There will be restricted access to the site and grazing and agricultural land would be lost due to the site of the property;
- The house should be sited right down with the main shed and barn;
- Highway concerns;
- Concerns with the public footpath and hedge;
- Concerns with overlooking;
- The application was compliant with mobile home sizing 6.8 x 20 which was the maximum permissible size;

Comments from Members included;

- Clarification sought on why this dwelling was permitted;
- The applicant needed to prove a functional, financial need for someone to live on this site which would be reviewed in 3 years' time;
- It had been proven that there was need for this temporary agricultural workers dwelling;
- If proven after 3 years that there was need for this dwelling an agricultural tie in perpetuity was needed;

Councillor Lithgow proposed and Councillor Hill seconded a motion for Conditional Approval to be **APPROVED** as per Officer Recommendation. Planning permission granted for a period of 3 years as set out in Condition 1.

The motion was carried

57. **3/37/21/006**

Application for Outline Planning Permission with all matters reserved, except for access, for the erection of 1 No. dwelling. Land between Beverley Drive and Goviers Lane, Watchet

Comments from members of the public included;

- Concerns that the application was infill in an already overdeveloped area;
- The application did not conform to Policies B-D in the Local Plan;
- Concerns with the impact of the site;
- Highway's have concerns over access and Wessex Water recommended a holding objection on the application;
- Access to the site concerns as this was a major pedestrian route;
- Concerns with the already overcrowded on street parking;
- Concerns that the current sewage system was barely adequate;
- Concerns that the development would increase the volume of surface water on the site as Armour Terrace was often waterlogged in times of heavy rain;
- The site was a natural soakaway for the surrounding area;
- Concerns that the site was not sustainable for development;
- This building plot was all that was left of the open land. Watchet Conservation Society had stated that although Alma Terrace was not listed, it was of historic merit;
- Concerns that this would effect the flight of the bats, the breeding birds and insects from the wet grass;
- Concerns that the site did not fit in with the Council's Climate Emergency Strategy;
- Watchet Town Council strongly objected to this application along with Watchet Conservation Society;
- This development would irrevocably impact on the unique identity of the area and its sense of place would not be sustained;
- Concerns with the height of the proposed building;
- Overbearing and overlooking onto Alma Terrace;
- The streetscape along this lane lacked cohesion and continuity with the surrounding area;
- An infill on this site would not be out of keeping with the surrounding area;
- The application has been made after due consideration of all the relevant economic social historic, conservation and environmental requirements and satisfied all aspects of the Local National Planning Policy;
- The scheme would deliver much needed housing in a sustainable location which was within easy walking distance of Watchet and would protect other green field sites;

Comments from Members included;

- Access issues to the site already exist and one extra house would not effect this;
- Concerns that this development was infill;
- Concerns with the ecological interests on this site;
- Drainage issues on the site;

Councillor Lithgow proposed and Councillor Hill seconded a motion for Outline Planning permission to be **GRANTED** with Conditions as per Officer Recommendation.

The motion was carried

At this point in the meeting a 15 minute break was proposed and seconded.

58. **38/21/0222**

Demolition of garage and erection of two storey extension to the side of 2 Glenthorne Road, Taunton

Comments from members of the public included;

- There was a whole mix of houses in Glenthorne Road and this development would not be out of keeping;
- No increase in the foot print of the site;
- The application would enhanced the area;
- No objections only support had been received from other local residents;
- This application was previously approved in 2013 by Taunton Deane Borough Council;
- The proposed extension would in no way impinge upon the local streetscape;
- No passing traffic and limited footfall in this Cul-de Sac;

Comments from Members included;

- There was plenty of room for this extension and it was not in any body's way. It was unfortunate that the previous Planning Policy changed;
- This application failed on a technicality due to Planning Policy changing. Every property in the street extended forward;
- This development would not affect the street scene;
- The proposed extension would greatly improve the visual impact of the existing garage;

Councillor Lithgow proposed and Councillor Wakefield seconded a motion for the Application to be **APPROVED** against Officer Recommendation.

Reasons – The extension was subservient to the existing building and was in keeping with other properties that had similar extensions. Development accords with Policy D5. Conditions to be agreed by the Chair and Principal Planning Specialist.

The motion was carried.

59. **53/21/0006**

Change of use of live/work unit to ancillary accommodation at 6 Luscombe Road, Cotford St Luke (retention of works already undertaken)

Comments by members of the public included;

- As a live/work unit the space above the garage could be used for business purposes;
- Working for home space had become crucial for the applicant over the last 20 months;
- The change of use to ancillary accommodation would meet the needs of the applicant's family and would improve the residential amenity of the area;
- The application was supported by 27 local residents;
- The change of use would give us flexibility use within the dwelling;

Comments by Members included;

- Pleased with the Condition for Ancillary use only;
- Concerns that the lease for these properties stated that the properties must not be used as additional housing;

Councillor Hill proposed and Councillor Wakefield seconded a motion for Conditional Approval to be **APPROVED** as per Officer Recommendation.

The motion was carried.

60. **Latest appeals and decisions received**

Latest appeals and decisions noted.

(The Meeting ended at 3.25 pm)